



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Homeric Catalogue of Ships. Edited with a commentary by
THOMAS W. ALLEN. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.

The author's endeavor is to show that the *Catalogue of Ships* gives "a true picture of the geography and political position of the Heroic Age." The *Catalogue*, he says (p. 168), "appears older than the body of the poems and the oldest Greek verse we possess." Homer "lived about 950-900 in Chios or Smyrna and compiled two poems on parts of the Trojan war out of already existing material which in our ignorance we may call equally well Chronicle or Saga" (p. 21). "In the Saga the *Catalogue* stood at the beginning," and Homer transferred it "to introduce the Wrath of Achilles." The *Catalogue* is, then, a document which is earlier than the Dorian conquest, "and seems to be in the first instance a national list of the Mycenaean dominions." "It is a document constituting a title: and as such was frequently appealed to in inter-state Greek matters from 600 B.C. onwards."

So much as to aim; as to form, the book is a systematic commentary on the geographical material in B 494-877, presented in ten chapters with a summary of conclusions in chapter xi. The method is set forth in the Introduction, paragraph v. Mr. Allen posits a historical document whose authenticity has been impugned. To change such a document is, he says, a form of fraud. Now fraud, if it exists, is in somebody's interest. If it can be shown that nobody's interest has been subserved, the charge that fraudulent changes have been made falls to the ground, and the document stands forth as authentic. Such a document is the *Catalogue*, Mr. Allen contends, and by such a method is its value to be tested. Such is the test applied in the ten chapters of the book.

The method finds its first application to the Boeotians who hold the foremost place in the *Catalogue*. The Boeotians who are already in full possession of the country send fifty ships to Troy. But here a difficulty emerges. Thucydides asserts that the present Boeotians came into the country sixty years after the Trojan war. The historian, evidently conscious that his statement conflicts with the *Catalogue*, adds parenthetically that a detachment of them came earlier. Mr. Allen holds that the date of the coming of the Boeotians into Boeotia is properly to be defined by the war of the Epigoni. This would give the same result as the *Catalogue*. Thucydides erred therefore in his main statement and approached the truth in his subsidiary statement made in deference to the *Catalogue*. The tradition which he erroneously accepted was probably put forward by the Aegid rulers of Thebes when they later became powerful.

Again, the *Catalogue* assigns to Agamemnon not only Mycenae but Corinth and certain coast towns on the Corinthian gulf. Such a relation

of Corinth to Mycenae, Mr. Allen argues, cannot be comprehended as an invention of the Corinthians of a later period. It is therefore to be regarded as based on fact. The conclusion drawn is that the *Catalogue* depicts the real relation of the cities in the Mycenaean period.

When the method comes to be applied to Rhodes and the neighboring islands, Mr. Allen accepts the implications of his position, although at considerable cost. What the implications are will appear from the following: the *Catalogue* mentions Greek warriors from Rhodes and Cos who are led by Heraclids. Now this reference to Heraclids is commonly reckoned an anachronism, for Heraclids are Dorians and Dorians are later than the Trojan war. This whole passage about the Dorian contingent is then according to the current view a late element in the *Catalogue*. But this accepted view is inconsistent with the hypothesis with which Mr. Allen is working, viz., that the *Catalogue* is wholly pre-Dorian and that it has resisted all later intrusions. He accordingly denies that "Heraclid" connotes "Dorian," and returns to the genealogies which placed Heracles and his immediate descendants an appropriate distance before the Trojan war.

The view that the *Catalogue* was a definite historical document, capable of resistance to the pressure of self-interest and proof against intrusions, although constantly subjected to deflecting influences, the view, in brief, that the *Catalogue* was "intangible," is maintained until the final chapter is reached. There the question is raised: "Is the *Catalogue* as we have it the original document? and where did it come from?" The answer given is: "It would be unreasonable to suppose that we have the *Catalogue* in its literal original form." Mr. Allen then eliminates the events later than the mustering at Aulis, viz., the references to Achilles, Protesilaus and Philoctetes. He furthermore grants that the twelve atheteses of the Alexandrians, including thirty-two verses, are most of them sound. Last of all he gives a hearing to two lesser catalogues, II 168-197, and N 685-722, and raises the question whether the lesser catalogues are amplifications of B or whether B itself is a reduction of an archetypal catalogue.

Here, then, near the end of the book, there is a new approach to the subject in hand. The argument gets a new orientation. It appears that the *Catalogue of Ships* is not after all something unique and singular, but that it is of the same tissue as certain other material that stands in the *Iliad*. It is, for example, comparable with the shorter catalogue in N. The subject is not further pursued, so that there is no consideration of the pertinent fact that the catalogues in B and N, in dealing with the same matters, show substantial points of difference. Nor again do the differences between the *Catalogue* and the body of the *Iliad* receive due attention. Mr. Allen makes the *Catalogue* older than the body of the poem (p. 168), and says: "The *Catalogue* and the rest of the poem agree very well."

The argument that is drawn from archaeological evidence to show that the *Catalogue* is a Mycenaean document may be, in general, summarized as follows: Since the area of the *Catalogue* and the area of the Mycenaean world are substantially coterminous, the two may be equated. In particular, Thessaly is offered in evidence, in that it seems an afterthought in the *Catalogue*, and is also upon archaeological evidence known to have been drawn within the Mycenaean sphere very late. Again, a conclusion is drawn from the Aegean islands. The *Catalogue* knows only the southern group in line with Crete, viz., Rhodes, Cos, and the others. Mr. Allen urges that these islands, as distinct from the more northerly, are Mycenaean. This, however, leads to the odd conclusion that the bulk of the Aegean islands had no part in that phase of the Aegean civilization called Mycenaean. The conclusion is at best *ex silentio*, and the question is one of fact. Thera and Melos certainly break the silence. Mr. Hogarth's map (*Enc. Brit.*, "Aegean Civilization") makes no such discrimination, and Fimmen's inventory (*Kretisch-Mykenische Kultur*, pp. 13-16) shows that many islands are to be credited with quite the same evidence in kind and amount that Mr. Allen honors for Rhodes and Cos. In the case of Mycenae and Tiryns, the *Catalogue*, in that it separates the two, directly traverses the conclusion furnished by the monuments that the sites belong together.

Concerning the *Catalogue of Ships* two judgments, complementary and not contradictory, have received general recognition. These are, first, that the *Catalogue* is a source of geographical and historical information of genuine value, and again, that the *Catalogue* as a whole, measured by the *Iliad* as a whole, is a late and secondary document. Of the evidence that exists for the second judgment Mr. Allen's commentary gives almost no idea. As to the first judgment he specifies the particular sense in which the *Catalogue* is a source by referring its information wholly to one—and that the very earliest—period, and by making it consist of but one stratum, without intrusions. To this conclusion one may say that the ultimate judgment about the *Catalogue* must rest upon a broader basis. As to the method which is followed throughout the discussion, that of taking a hypothesis and reordering the material in the light of it so as to get a better total picture—that method is indeed legitimate, but in the end it must be justified by the result. The result which one has a right to expect will have a twofold aspect; it will offer a new synthesis of all relevant material such as will illumine the whole field without at the same time imposing new difficulties. In this case the new result offered is the proposal to put the *Catalogue* first, as something that was there before Homer and that traced the line to which Homer hewed. Leaving that question to be decided by the jury of Homeric readers, and considering only the new difficulties imposed, one finds at least two. First a legal and static view of the *Catalogue* is assumed, the view that in an age

of oral transmission a canonical document existed that always was canonical and that never went through any appreciable process of becoming so; and that the *Catalogue* in B is, or contains, that document. Further, the position taken about the Heraclids in Rhodes, and the acceptance of the generations of Heracles and Meleager in T and I as "older than their context" (p. 168), involve a return to the reasoning of the ancients whereby genealogies are immediately convertible into historical conclusions.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

EDWARD FITCH

Griechische Verskunst. VON ULRICH v. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF.
Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1921.

This is a reprint of *Choriambische dimeter commentariola metrica duo* and *De versu phalaeceo*, padded out with new matter, evidently from the notes of lectures to students, and text-criticism to fill a volume of 630 pages. There are, of course, some suggestions of interest to specialists, but there are no new or helpful ideas for the practical study of Greek metric, and the book will only confuse the student, who would do better to keep to his Christ. A rambling and gossipy introduction treats of Greek and modern verse, poetry and prose, the metrical theories of the Greeks, and the history of Greek *Verskunst*. It is all very thin and superficial, though not unreadable. Its main purpose is to insist on the unique quality of Greek metric, the necessity of studying it from a historical and evolutionary point of view, the impossibility of any generalized metric applicable to different languages, and more especially the futility of all attempts to illustrate Greek meters by the English poetry, which Professor Wilamowitz does not know. Neither here nor in the special part that follows is any real evidence offered either in support of the arbitrary assumption that different Greek tribes must have poured their feelings into different metrical molds, or in confirmation of the hundreds of arbitrary affirmations as to the presumable historical derivation of one metrical pattern, form, or phrase from another. It is a mere game of reducing selected groups of longs and shorts to approximate equivalence, by addition, subtraction, and substitution, a juggling with such terms as *Reizianum*, *praxilleion*, *aeschrioneum*, *logaoedicum*, *archebulium*, *anaclastic dochmiacs*, *phrynicheion*, *hemiepes*, *enoplion*, *lekythion*, *ithyphallic*, *encomiologicus*.

In what is apparently a silent recognition that this procedure has been criticized Wilamowitz says they are "*bequem*." But are they? And to whom? Outside of half a dozen specialists, actually engaged in writing on metric, there is not a living scholar who can read and understand these pages without looking up the terminology in Christ's index, and testing the